### **REMARKS**

## Rejections

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

## Claims 1-28

Claims 1-28 as amended on May 3, 2007 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Costello in view of Villard and further in view of Hunter.

Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Costello discloses a syntax through which a XML instance document indicates the schema to which it conforms. Hunter discloses the syntactic rules to express and combine Description Schemes and Descriptors. Villard discloses a model used for the generation of adaptable presentations.

In the previous response dated May 3, 2007, Applicant amended independent claims 1, 8, 11, 14, 18, 22, 26, 27 and 28 to contain the limitation that the specific application domain includes a new multimedia description element derived from multimedia description elements in the general application domain which is not included in the general application domain. Examiner asserts that Villard teaches this claim limitation.

Applicant respectfully disagrees because Villard does not disclose or suggest such a limitation. Nowhere does Villard disclose a new multimedia description element that is not included in the general application domain as claimed by Applicant.

In addition, neither Costello nor Hunter disclose the claimed limitation. Furthermore, Hunter discloses that the DDL must be platform and application independent, and human- and machine-readable. Modifying Hunter would impair the backward compatibility and platform independence of the application specific domain. Hunter therefore teaches away from implementing an application specific domain containing a new multimedia description element not included in the general application domain. Moreover, because Hunter requires that the DDL must be platform and application independent, the proposed modification would render Hunter unsuitable for its intended purpose. Therefore, the proposed combination is improper. (MPEP 2143.01.V).

Because the combination of Villard, Hunter, and Costello is improper and further does not render obvious an application specific domain containing a new multimedia description element not included in the general application domain as claimed in claims 1-28 of Applicant's invention, Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-28 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

### **SUMMARY**

Claims 1-28 are currently pending. In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the application and allowance of the pending claims.

If the Examiner determines the prompt allowance of these claims could be facilitated by a telephone conference, the Examiner is invited to contact Sue Holloway at (408) 720-8300 x3476.

# **Deposit Account Authorization**

Authorization is hereby given to charge our Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any charges that may be due. Furthermore, if an extension is required, then Applicant hereby requests such extension.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR

& ZAFMAN LLR

Dated 10.26, 2007

Sheryl Sue Holloway Attorney for Applicant Registration No. 37,850

1279 Oakmead Parkway Sunnyvale, CA 94085-4040 (408) 720-8300 x3476